

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-43 are pending. Claims 1-43 stand rejected.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102***

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 19-27, 29-35 and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Haneda (Pat No. 6,483,602).

Claim 1 reads, in part, “*determining whether the storage medium has been assigned a unique volume label and a unique storage medium label, the unique storage medium label uniquely identifying the storage medium*” (emphasis added). The examiner states that this is taught by Haneda: “the identification code on the user’s disk is compared with the identification code attached to the image data preserved on the lab’s disk in the laboratory system, col. 20, lines 25-30...” Applicants respectfully disagree. As Applicants understand the cited portion of Haneda, it merely teaches that a disk has an identification code; however, it teaches nothing about making a determination regarding a unique storage medium label and teaches nothing regarding actions taken when the storage medium contains no unique storage medium label. Consequently, Haneda cannot anticipate claim 1. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably defines over Haneda and is in condition for allowance.

The examiner rejected claim 20, in part, for similar reasons as for claim 1, and applicants respectfully disagree for the same reasons as above. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 also patentably defines over Haneda and is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons analyzed above.

Claim 15 reads, in part, “accepting one or more search parameters selected from a group of parameters consisting of (A) *file name*, (B) *file size*, (C) *file author* and (D) *file type*” (emphasis added). The examiner states that the claimed “accepting one or more search parameters” is taught by Haneda: “user requests extra prints from laboratory, col. 4, lines 5-15.” Furthermore, the examiner states that the claimed “selected from a group of parameters consisting of (A) *file name*, (B) *file size*, (C) *file author* and (D) *file type*” is taught by Haneda at col. 54, lines 35-40.

Applicants respectfully submit that col. 54 does not exist in Haneda and suggest that perhaps the reference is to col. 5. Applicants will proceed as if the reference is to col. 5. If applicants are incorrect in doing so, applicants respectfully request that the office action be reissued with the correct reference.

Haneda, col. 5, lines 35-40 reads in full:

Corresponding to each of these clear text IDs is an 8-byte key, which may be supplied by the computer owner or generated by the computer as a function of the IDs. A key is a bit pattern which is used in the encryption process and which may be stored in a secure portion of the PC's memory.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of the reference does not teach “a group of parameters consisting of (A) *file name*, (B) *file size*, (C) *file author* and (D) *file type*.” As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is in condition for allowance because not every element of the claim is taught by the cited reference.

The examiner rejected claim 35, in part, for similar reasons as for claim 35, and applicants respectfully disagree for the same reasons as above. As such, applicants respectfully submit that claim 35 is in condition for allowance.

For at least the reason that dependent claims 2-8, 10-14, 19, 21-27, 29-34 and 39-42 depend from one of independent claims 1, 15, 20 and 35 and claims 1, 15, 20 and 35 are in condition for allowance, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, 10-14, 19, 21-27, 29-34 and 39-42 are in condition for allowance.

### ***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 9 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haneda in view of Pond et al (Pat No. 4,864,616; hereinafter “Pond”). Claims 18 and 38 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haneda in view of Raistrick et al (Pat No. 5,971,279; hereinafter “Raistrick”).

For at least the reason that claims 9, 18, 29 and 38 depend from allowable independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 18, 29 and 39 are in condition for allowance.

**DOCKET NO.:** \*\*19-0088  
**Application No.:** 09/941,072  
**Office Action Dated:** December 21, 2007

**PATENT**

The examiner stated that claims 1-43 are rejected, but has given no rationale as to why claims 16, 17, 36, 37, and 43 are rejected – not even what section of the USC they are rejected under. As such, applicants are unable to respond to these rejections. However, applicants respectfully submit that claims 16, 17, 36, 37 and 43 are in condition for allowance for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claims. While applicants believe the application as it stands is in condition for allowance, should examiner disagree in any way, applicants respectfully request that the examiner re-issue the office action with rationale for why these five claims are rejected.

### **CONCLUSION**

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: March 21, 2008

/Michael J. Swope/  
Michael J. Swope  
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439